# FEED THE FUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative

## Feed the Future Market Systems and Partnerships

### MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING PLAN

January 2021

## USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# Feed the Future Market Systems and Partnerships (MSP)

## MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING (MEL) PLAN

Durable, systemic, and inclusive agriculture-led growth

| | |
|---|---|
| **Activity Title:** | Feed the Future Market Systems and Partnerships |
| **Sponsoring USAID Office:** | Bureau for Resilience and Food Security |
| **Award Number:** | 7200AA20C00054 |
| **Awardee**: | DAI Global, LLC. |
| **Date of Publication**: | January 8, 2021 |
| **USAID Contact:** | Kristin O'Planick, Contracting Officer's Representative<br>koplanick@usaid.gov |
| **Activity Contact:** | Bronwyn Irwin, Chief of Party<br>Bronwyn_Irwin@FtF-MSP.org |

# Table of Contents

# Tables and Figures

# Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| BFS | Bureau for Resilience and Food Security |
| CBO | Community-based Organization |
| CLA | Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting |
| CO | Contracting Officer |
| COP | Chief of Party |
| COR | Contracting Officer's Representative |
| CSV | Comma Separated Values |
| DAI | DAI Global |
| DCOP | Deputy Chief of Party |
| eSRS | Electronic Subcontractor Reporting System |
| GFSS | Global Food Security Strategy |
| MEL | Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning |
| MSD | Market Systems Development |
| MSMEs | Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises |
| MSP | Market Systems and Partnerships |
| NGO | Nongovernmental Organization |
| OPIC | Overseas Private Investment Corporation |
| PIRS | Performance Indicator Reference Sheet |
| PII | Personally Identifiable Information |
| PPP | Public-Private Partnerships |
| PSE | Private Sector Engagement |
| RFS | Bureau for Resilience and Food Security |
| SSR | Summary Subcontracting Report |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| USD | United States International Development Finance Corporation |
| USG | United States Government |

# I.  Introduction

This Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Plan describes how the Feed the Future Market Systems & Partnerships Activity (MSP) monitors its progress, approaches collaboration and learning, manages data, reports results, and disseminates knowledge products throughout the Activity lifecycle. Inherent to achieving MSP and broader United States Agency for International Development (USAID) objectives are effective MEL processes that measure outcomes to inform programming and drive iterative adaptation. The MSP MEL approach is driven by a collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) approach based on deep collaboration with other Activities, experts, and donors working with market systems development (MSD) and private sector engagement (PSE), routine collection of quality performance data – informed by the MSP Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan – informative analysis, and learning dissemination. This model further emphasizes continual measurement of mechanism and buy-in level outcomes and subsequent adaptation to challenges and successes. The MEL Plan's utility as a management and learning tool will be maintained throughout the life of the Activity by updating and revising the plan as necessary to reflect the addition of new data collection and management processes, and to reflect any changes or adjustments to performance indicators approved by the MSP Contract Officer's Representative (COR).

The MEL Plan is organized as follows: the first section provides an overview of MSP, as well as its purpose and objectives. The second section details MSP's approach to monitoring, including the guiding principles underlying its monitoring strategy and indicator rationale. The third section presents a brief summary of MSP's approach to learning and integrates USAID's CLA framework. Section 4 describes protocols for managing data and ensuring data quality throughout the data lifecycle, from initial collection to final reporting to USAID. Section 5 describes MEL roles and responsibilities, and a MEL change log is included as Section 6.

## 1.1 Activity Description

MSP is designed under the USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) to provide evidence to USAID/Washington, USAID Missions, and other U.S. Government (USG) Operating Units and their implementing partners – international and local. Its aim is to design, implement, monitor, and evaluate MSD and PSE activities that lead to inclusive and resilient agricultural-led economic growth, improved food security and nutrition, and/or increased incomes for the poor. MSP ultimately seeks to improve the effectiveness of Feed the Future, USAID, and other USG programs to bring about sustained development outcomes at scale. PSE and MSD approaches to programming support USAID's Journey to Self-Reliance[1] initiative in that they emphasize in-country resourcing and enterprise-driven growth, placing local systems at the heart of sustainable results, and identifying strategic partners best positioned to advance self-reliance and share accountability.[2]

MSP activities support the Feed the Future initiative in alignment with the USG Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS)[3], the USAID Private Sector Engagement Policy[4], and the USAID Private Sector Engagement Evidence and Learning Plan[5]. The Activity contributes to achieving the GFSS Results

---

[1] USAID. *The Journey to Self-Reliance: Supporting partner countries to lead their own development challenges*: https://bit.ly/3cnpAtB
[2] USAID. Integrating the Journey to Self-Reliance into Activity Design: https://bit.ly/2RL3IUQ
[3] USAID Food Security Strategy: https://bit.ly/3kvBg18
[4] USAID PSE Policy: https://bit.ly/3abSFXS
[5] USAID Private Sector Engagement Evidence and Learning Plan: https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/15396/PSE_Evidence-and-Learning-Plan_081219.pdf

Framework Objective 1: *Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth* and assists with GFSS Objective 2: *Strengthened resilience among people and systems* and GFSS Objective 3: *a well-nourished population, especially among women and children*.

MSP also advances evidence and learning under the PSE Evidence and Learning Plan's priority questions: 1. How and to what extent does private sector engagement improve development and humanitarian outcomes? 2. What context-specific factors drive effective engagement with the private sector? 3. What PSE relationship qualities influence results?

Finally, MSP also contributes to advancing the development objectives of USAID Missions and Operating Units, subject to buy-in.

# 1.2 Activity Objectives

USAID's Private Sector Engagement Policy signals an intentional shift to pursue market-based approaches and catalyze commercial investment as a means to accelerate countries' progress in achieving sustainable economic growth and prosperity. Agriculture and food market systems – embedded in local contexts[6] – are foundational in achieving nutrition and resilience objectives. USAID seeks to facilitate change such that market actors – including the private sector, public sector, and civil society – shift behaviors in a way that catalyzes competitiveness, inclusiveness, and resilience in the market system.

Current capacity to deliver programs that use PSE and MSD approaches varies widely, and learning from adopters is not well captured, analyzed, or communicated. As Feed the Future expands its use of market systems facilitation approaches[7] to achieve its objectives, it also seeks to expand the evidence base around MSD and understanding of good practice. USAID Missions and other development actors seeking to employ PSE and MSD need tactical guidance, evidence, analytics, updated tools, and other types of practical support.

In support of Feed the Future's use of PSE and MSD approaches – and as a means to achieving more competitive, inclusive, and resilient market systems – the purpose of MSP is to advance learning and good practice and support cultural and operational transformation on PSE and MSD within USAID/Washington, USAID Missions, partners, and beyond. MSP will provide support in areas such as strategic opportunity identification, co-creation facilitation, partnership development, partnership management, market research and analytics, monitoring data collection and evaluation services, data collection and analytics, research studies, and training development and delivery. The Activity's four objectives fall into two broad tiers:

**Field support functions** with the potential for "buy-ins" to conduct discreet activities that are within MSP's technical and strategic scope of advancing PSE and MSD learning and good practice.

- **Objective 1**: To support effective private-sector partnership development and management.

- **Objective 2**: To provide analytical and other services in support of design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of market systems and private sector engagement activities.

---

[6] USAID Local Systems Framework: https://bit.ly/3ahB3d5
[7] *A Framework for Inclusive Market System Development* was developed as part of USAID's The Leveraging Economic Opportunities (LEO) Activity: https://bit.ly/3akkhKr

Global leadership functions focused on advancing global goods.[8]

- **Objective 3**: To generate knowledge on both MSD and PSE.

- **Objective 4**: To build capacity to design, implement, monitor, evaluate, and learn from market systems and private sector engagement activities.


While the objectives lend themselves predominantly to one or the other of these functional categories, there may be instances when activities will be cross-cutting, such as a mission buy-in for a specific capacity building activity.


## 1.3 Audiences

The primary stakeholders for MSP and therefore the primary audiences for the MEL Plan are USAID, implementers, and market actors. MSP tailors results reporting and knowledge products that appeal to the interests and objectives of the following stakeholders:

- **USAID Missions, Bureaus, and Independent Offices**
  - USAID staff that are seeking to advance learning, best practice, and adoption of PSE and MSD approaches or to use these approaches to achieve their development objectives. Engagement with these partners focuses on evidence and analytics to advance learning and establish good practice. Collaboration, learning, and related communications relevant to these stakeholders will also focus on answering tactical questions and expanding practice based on *how* best to utilize PSE and MSD approaches in program design and implementation and to meet Performance Management Plan targets.
  - USAID staff that are not currently seeking to utilize PSE or MSD approaches to achieve development objectives. Collaboration and learning with these stakeholders will focus on *why* utilizing PSE and MSD can be useful in achieving development objectives.
- **Implementing Partners** of USAID, both international and local, that are already implementing programs with PSE and MSD or are interested in doing so. Engagement with these stakeholders will focus on strategies and tools to strengthen, facilitate, and standardize their work.
- **Market Actors**, including multi-nationals, US private firms and local micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), partner governments, and civil society. These partners have a wide range of experience with USAID programs, as well as with the theory and practice of PSE and MSD.


# 2. Monitoring Plan

MSP provides a nuanced and iterative approach to activity monitoring, driven by learning and client needs. MSP's monitoring strategy is shaped by the tiered nature of the Activity's objectives, the varying audiences for results reporting and knowledge products, and the diverse learning needs of the PSE and MSD practitioner communities. MSP monitors the convergent progress of its buy-ins – with their diverse stakeholders and scales of practice – while at the same time acknowledging divergent, context-specific monitoring and adaptive management needs. The overall monitoring framework is broad and

---

[8] Some funding for global leadership functions may also come from buy-ins.

nimble, allowing individual buy-ins to contribute top-line metrics toward MSP's overall results, while integrating more targeted monitoring strategies for individual buy-ins where needed.

Performance monitoring relies on both qualitative and quantitative methods, complemented to go beyond transactional metrics to capture transformational results. A set of overall indicators are applied Activity-wide, with additional indicators, as needed, for some buy-ins focused on facilitating partnerships under Objective I, supporting effective private-sector partnership development and management.

## 2.1 Performance Monitoring

MSP is designed to be a diverse, fast-moving funding mechanism that catalyzes investment in PSE and MSD. As a result, performance monitoring at the Activity-wide level is initially limited to five indicators of MSP's overall performance. The initial indicators – along with complementary measurements and research to be determined – aim to help demonstrate overall impact of MSP activities. The initial overall indicators aim to gauge the scale and quality of MSP's services.

- **Indicator**: **Number of buy-in commitments for MSP services**. As a requirement, each MSP buy-in contributes towards the advancement of learning and good practice on PSE and MSD. A key top-line metric of MSP's reach and the demand for MSP services is the number of buy-ins funded through the mechanism.

- **Indicator**: **Number of MSP collaborators**. At the global leadership level, MSP engages practitioners and thought leaders that support PSE and MSD learning and good practice, as well as help to drive the cultural and operational transformations the activity seeks to catalyze within USAID and its implementing partners. This indicator tracks all organizations and independent consultants that collaborate with MSP in its work. This could include sub-contractors, grantees, independent consultants, or advisors. To be counted as a *collaborator*, the individual or organization must contribute – directly or as an advisor – to an MSP technical deliverable (see PIRS sheet in Annex I for more information).

- **Indicator**: **Number of learning products**. MSP's global leadership functions advance learning and good practice by providing technical learning products – including technical reports, briefing papers, guidance documents, training materials and webinars – in areas such as partnership development, partnership management, market research and analytics, monitoring data collection and evaluation services, data collection and analytics, research studies, and training development and delivery.

- **Indicator**: **Number of individuals accessing MSP learning products**. MSP's success is dependent on the scale of outreach for MSP learning and the uptake and application of that learning by the Activity's stakeholders. This indicator provides some measure of the volume of exposure of MSP stakeholders to Activity learning products or technical output deliverables (as defined in the previous indicator) by tracking webinar/workshop/conference event attendance records, website page views and downloads of MSP learning products. MSP will identify additional indicators at a later date to capture uptake of Activity learning or influence of MSP on application of best practice.

- **Indicator**: **Average client satisfaction score**. A key validation that MSP produces useful and effective knowledge products and services is client satisfaction. MSP's clients, the Activity Managers for each buy-in, are given a client satisfaction survey, scoring on a scale of 1-5.[9] The survey also solicits qualitative information from clients so that MSP can capture nuance unique to each client and

---

[9] MSP's client satisfaction survey to be developed in the first year of implementation.

deliverable. This survey will be conducted at the conclusion of the assignment for short-term activities and will be conducted annually for long-term activities.

In addition to the Activity-wide monitoring, for some buy-ins focused on facilitating private-sector partnerships under Objective 1, MSP will develop buy-in-specific monitoring strategies that incorporate the two standard indicators described below, as well as any applicable FTF or EG standard indicators potentially including EG 3.2-26, Value of annual sales of producers and firms receiving USG assistance or EG.3.2-27, Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance. The initial indicators to be applied to all Objective 1 buy-ins are the following:

- **Indicator: Value of new USG commitments and private-sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition (EG.3.1-14)**. Although "dollars leveraged" is not on its own the most meaningful indicator for assessing development impact, it provides a normalized metric for understanding scale of additionality across diverse contexts. Supplemental buy-in level indicators and complementary quantitative and qualitative measures at the global leadership level in future iterations of MSP's monitoring plan will seek to add nuance and depth of meaning to the dollar value leveraged figure. MSP more broadly aims to identify meaningful indicators to measure the effectiveness of USAID PSE efforts for development results and the priorities of private-sector partners.

- **Indicator: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of MSP funding** (retired standard indicator EG.3.2-5). One of the main rationales for partnership is that it facilitates faster, larger, or better development impacts than the public or private sector would be able to achieve working alone.[10] The number of partnerships alone, however, does not tell a comprehensive story of additionality. In the monitoring of this indicator and supplemental studies, MSP seeks to contribute to the answer to *Question 1* of USAID's Private Sector Evidence and Learning Plan: *how and to what extent does private sector engagement improve development and humanitarian outcomes?*[11] In the formation of partnerships, MSP and buy-ins seek to advance competitiveness through approaches steeped in the business case for the partnership. Partnerships are also formed with respect to shared value, enhancing the competitiveness of a firm, while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it occurs.

This MEL Plan will be updated over the life of Activity and it is expected that additional indicators will be incorporated to capture influence of the MSP activity itself. A Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) for each indicator is included as Annex I.

## 2.2 Iterating the Monitoring Strategy

MSP employs a phased strategy to MEL, with an initial phase before MSP activities are specified through buy-ins focused on identifying focal areas for learning. This initial phase prioritizes measuring overarching output indicators while the learning agenda is further refined. In subsequent phases, as additional buy-ins further develop MSP's focus and iterative learning evolves MSP's Learning Agenda, the MSP team will continue to refine the MEL strategy. In alignment with Chapter 201 of USAID's Program Cycle Operational Policy[12], this MEL Plan is a living document that evolves as the strategic objectives, priorities, and lessons from buy-ins are incorporated into MSP's strategy. Annual revisions to the MEL

---

[10] OECD. *Understanding Key Terms and Modalities for Private Sector Engagement in Development Co-operation*: https://bit.ly/34X0Ir8
[11] USAID. *Private Sector Engagement Evidence and Learning Plan*: https://bit.ly/2FbwXYr
[12] Automated Directives System (ADS) Chapter 201: https://bit.ly/3guPITG

Plan maintain fidelity to MSP's objectives, while also incorporating insights from review of the plausibility of the Activity's underlying assumptions.

Future MEL phases will increasingly focus on MSP's transformational results, including its influence on the design and implementation of USAID procurements through knowledge products and toolkits generated by the Activity, as well as strengthening of networks important for PSE and MSD approaches to achieve scale, sustainability, and reach. Importantly, the creation of meaningful Activity impact indicators first requires clearly defined intended results within a clear, comprehensive conceptual framework. Strong indicators that measure meaningful transformational results are unlikely to flow from broad guiding principles or purely aspirational objectives.[13] Therefore the development of these transformational impact indicators will await further refinement of the MSP Activities and learning agenda.

As stated in ADS 201.3.5.5, *performance monitoring* can miss results that do not conform to prior expectations and where change is non-linear.[14] Complementary monitoring approaches that are complexity-aware are appropriate in dynamic contexts where results are difficult to predict and where cause-and-effect relationships are initially unclear.[15] As MSP's MEL strategy matures, it endeavors to incorporate complexity-aware complementary monitoring to improve performance monitoring, support adaptive management, and to act as a link between the Activity's monitoring strategy and its learning agenda.

# 3. Learning Plan

As a research and learning Activity, MSP is not only accountable for measuring its expected results and impact, but also to contribute to a robust Agency-wide learning agenda where there is continued debate about the best way to achieve results and low agreement on which results are desirable – even among experts. The MEL strategy is grounded in CLA as a guiding principle, and MSP seeks to utilize rapid tools and processes that support evidence-based decision-making and learning. Lessons from a robust learning agenda, transversely, inform refinement of MSP's results monitoring as learning streams are developed, refined, dropped, or scaled.

## 3.1 Collaboration, Learning, and Adapting

MSP's full CLA Plan is maintained as a separate standalone document and captures the Activity's strategy for CLA. As a key mechanism for interaction between MEL and CLA, MSP organizes semi-annual "pause-and-reflect" sessions with core partners to capture learning and adapt the Learning Agenda as needed. In addition, MSP organizes quarterly buy-in "pause-and-reflect" sessions with USAID buy-in Activity Manager's, stakeholders, and partners to capture learning from implementation, results achieved and challenges experienced in these PSE and MSD activities, allowing activities to be adaptive in nature. For positive outcomes, MSP will capture a distillation of the variables and conditions that contributed to the success and may affect adoption in other contexts. The MSP team will identify challenges and the needed

---

[13] Beam Exchange. *Features of a market systems approach.* The summary write up includes examples of aspirational/ guiding principle-based objectives that are widely cited in MSD programming, and which on their own – without more specificity – do not lend themselves to meaningful indicators: https://bit.ly/3kEtYXX

[14] USAID. *ADS Chapter 201: Program Cycle Operational Policy, 201.3.5.5 Types of Program Monitoring*: https://bit.ly/3i1jfFe

[15] USAID. Program Cycle Discussion Note: Complexity-aware Monitoring: https://bit.ly/3i4BvxE

remediation actions for any problems. In doing so, MSP refines and re-applies PSE and MSD solutions, laying the groundwork for a process of adaptation and the emergence of a process for best practices. MSP will hold after action reviews at the end of each buy-in to debrief on learning captured from the given activity, and for long-term buy-ins will do the same after major milestones such as after each round of grant solicitations.

Pause-and-reflect sessions additionally aim to articulate learning pathway stories, where participants articulate how various learning progressed over the period of activity implementation. This type of learning is difficult to plan for but can be powerful. Learning pathway stories have the potential to influence more formal learning streams within MSP's learning agenda.

# 4. Data Management

The data management MEL function encompasses data collection, storage, retrieval, analysis, and use. This function requires that a robust and interactive – and nimble in MSP's case – data management system is put in place to provide timely information for evidence-based decision making. MSP works within buy-in client reporting and tracking systems by funneling all field data from subcontractors and consultants into the core MSP data repository, utilizing designated points of accountability within MSP's core staff, and providing clean, validated, aggregated data directly to the client system(s).

## 4.1 Data Collection and Storage

MSP collects both primary data and secondary data reported from buy-ins, both qualitative and quantitative data, and data at both the global leadership and field function levels. To accommodate the iterating and widely varied nature of monitoring and evaluation throughout the Activity lifecycle, MSP maintains an array of data collection tools for potential use.

Whenever possible, primary quantitative data are collected or logged using a customizable cloud-based platform and database called DAI Collect, built on the open-source tool KoboToolbox.[16] DAI Collect includes data quality control, team management, and offline functionality that make it ideal for use in diverse and unpredictable contexts. Where appropriate, DAI Collect is used as a data reporting tool for buy-ins and other partners, integrating data from diverse sources into a single data repository. MSP also integrates quantitative data collected using other tools – including as straightforward as Excel – with the requirement that the tools should include the ability to export machine readable, comma separated values (CSV) datasets. Where possible and useful, quantitative data, as well as quantifications of qualitative data, are managed in a relational data model using Microsoft Power BI, where the data are transformed, aggregated, and calculated in an audit ready manner, with clear documentation at each step.

Qualitative data, whether primary or secondary, are stored and labeled for analysis in NVivo. The software is ideal for building and maintaining robust qualitative datasets. Qualitative data stored in Nvivo are largely primary data collected by MSP, but whenever relevant and feasible, interview notes and other qualitative data collected by partners is also stored and labeled in MSP's Nvivo software. Handling raw

---

[16] https://www.kobotoolbox.org/#home

qualitative data in this way allows for long-term, cross-cutting, and unanticipated analyses to be conducted as MSP's monitoring and learning evolves over the life of the Activity.

Source documents are stored in DAI's cloud file storage system, with access permissions carefully managed by MSP's MEL Manager. Only the Chief of Party (COP) approves access. All raw data and evidence documentation are accessible for USAID initiated data audits and for submission to USAID's Digital Data Library, in accordance with ADS 579.3.2.[17]

## 4.2 Data Quality

MSP integrates built-in checks on data quality and accuracy from collection to reporting. For primary data collection, this includes embedding accuracy checks into data collection forms, such as validity ranges for numeric entries, drop-down menus for location, or backend calculations for conditional logic or applying weights. MSP encourages similar quality control steps be implemented by all partners, the details of which should be articulated along with any raw data or results submitted to MSP.

Key to data quality are detailed clarity and consistency around definitions of indicator terms, documentation, and methodologies. MSP's MEL Manager leads on orientation, training, and mentoring of MSP and partner staff – where appropriate – around data capture, verification, and analysis, including familiarizing them with the performance indicators and their respective definitions as outlined in the PIRS.

## 4.3 Data Security

All data are password protected and safeguarded through differentiated levels of user access. Apart from MEL staff, the Senior Learning and Communications Advisor, the COP, and the Deputy Chief of Party (DCOP), only have access to aggregate and anonymized data wherever possible. External users only have access to aggregated data summaries, such as indicator dashboards and descriptive statistics. Personally identifiable information (PII) is protected to the fullest extent possible. Any raw data submitted to USAID will be scrubbed of all PII.

# 5. Roles, Responsibilities, and Schedule

## 5.1 Responsibilities and Roles

The MSP COP has overarching responsibility for overseeing MEL and assuring that evidence from monitoring data management meet USAID's data quality standards[18] and needs for learning, decision making, and adaptive management. Day-to-day management of data collection, verification, management, analysis, visualization, and reporting are overseen by the Senior Learning and Communications Advisor and MEL Manager. With oversight from the MEL Manager and the COP, the Engagement Manager negotiates appropriate indicators and associated MEL and reporting approaches with buy-in clients, as well as ensures adherence by implementors to agreed approaches.

---

[17] https://www.usaid.gov/development-data-library
[18] USAID. Documented in ADS 201.3.5.8. Overview available in *How-to Note: Conduct a Data Quality Assessment*: https://bit.ly/2HP4mq6

The Senior Learning and Communications Advisor and MEL Manager are responsible for producing MEL reports on time, and in a technically valid, high-quality, and client-relevant manner, with the purpose of providing firm grounds for management decisions. The Senior Learning and Communications Advisor leads the iteration of MSP's MEL approach and the MEL Plan, and is responsible for ensuring data collection and data storage are securely protected and gathered with the highest ethical standards.

MSP's COP approves internal learning capture documents and MSP's COR provides approval for anything shared outside of the Activity itself.

A summarized breakdown of MEL roles and responsibilities is provided in the following table.

**Table 1. MSP MEL Roles and Responsibilities**

| COP | Senior Learning and Communications Manager | MEL Manager | Engagement Manager(s) | DCOP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| • Defines and negotiates performance indicators internally for approval by USAID.<br><br>• Spearheads progress review and reflection on Activity performance.<br><br>• Devises remediation strategies and measures.<br><br>• Sets and negotiates indicator target with USAID.<br><br>• Responsible for ensuring quality of the M&E data reported to USAID.<br><br>• Conducts final review of all reports and submits them to USAID. | • Oversees the MEL system, including data management systems and procedures.<br><br>• Develops MSP primary data collection forms conceptual lead for results reports.<br><br>• Oversees MSP primary data collection.<br><br>• Analyzes results and prepares reports for COP review and submission to USAID.<br><br>• Facilitates regular pause and reflect sessions.<br><br>• With the COP, designs and oversees implementation of specialized studies and updating of the Learning Agenda.<br><br>• Identifies MEL capacity gaps at all levels and designs solutions. | • Methodological, conceptual, and operational lead for the MEL system, including data management systems and procedures.<br><br>• Leads the buy-in MEL and results reporting.<br><br>• Identifies MEL capacity gaps and trains MSP and partner staff on tools and procedures as needed and appropriate.<br><br>• Leads on implementation of data quality control.<br><br>• Facilitates design of data visualizations and reports for internal users.<br><br>• Maintains raw data backups. | • Assists in identifying appropriate indicators for buy-ins and defining key indicator terminology.<br><br>• Assists in data collection from partners and data verification and validation.<br><br>• Co-facilitates regular pause-and-reflect sessions with buy-ins.<br><br>• Prepares buy-in progress reports. | • Oversees the collection of relevant data through the grants management process. |

# 5.2 Monitoring and Reporting Frequency

MSP provides the COR with a written report on activities and results as part of its semi-annual progress reports. Indicator results are updated semi-annually, annually, or at the close of a buy-in. MSP will provide buy-in Activity Managers with quarterly reports, as required. MSP is a flexible buy-in mechanism that expands or contracts according to utilization by USAID Operating Units and Missions, and this includes scope and scale of monitoring and reporting activities. Systemic changes will be included in the Change Log.

The following table is an overview of regular reports to be submitted by MSP to USAID.

**Table 2. Schedule of reports to USAID**

| Deliverables | Due Dates | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Annual Work Plan and revised MEL Plan | Due 30 days prior to the start of each fiscal year | The Annual Work Plan is intended to be a flexible working document for use of the Contractor and USAID staff. The Work Plan must include an activity timeline, description, and level of effort at a minimum. This MEL Plan is a living document that evolves as the strategic objectives, priorities, and lessons from buy-ins are incorporated into MSP's strategy. Annual revisions to the MEL Plan maintain fidelity to MSP's objectives, while also incorporating insights from review of the plausibility of the Activity's underlying assumptions. |
| Semi-annual Progress Reports | Due within 15 working days after the end of March and September of each year. | This report includes progress of major activities; problems encountered and proposed remediation actions; discussions of salient programmatic trends that can be distilled from major activities that are in process or recently completed; highlights of unresolved or on-going administrative/bureaucratic constraints to the contractor's optimal performance; and an update of which will be used as part of future award evaluations. |
| Final Report | Due by close out. | This report will summarize program highlights, achievements, and major activities; funds obligated and disbursed; a summary of activity implementation and appraisal; problems encountered and how they were rectified. This report replaces the Semi-Annual and Annual Reports but must cover the topics/format of these reports at a minimum. |
| Subcontract Reporting: Electronic Subcontractor Reporting System (eSRS) | Due April 30th and October 30th of each year. | Each semi-annual Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR) reflects cumulative subcontracting accomplishments from the inception of the contract through the relevant SSR reporting period. The report is submitted electronically via DAI's eSRS. |

# 6. Change Log

The activity MEL plan is adjusted in response to new information, changes in context, and as needed at established intervals. This section includes a table to describe the changes that are made to the MEL plan over time.

**Table 3. Change Log**

| Date | Change by: | Change to: | Justification: |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Annex I: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)

| USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet |
|---|
| **Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Cross-cutting |
| **Name of Indicator:** Number of MSP buy-ins |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No_X__     Yes___  For Reporting Year(s)_ FY2020 – FY 2023__** |
| **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** |
| **DESCRIPTION** |
| **Precise Definition(s):** The indicator is a tally of USAID Missions and other USG Operating Unit buy-in initiatives funded through MSP.<br><br>MSP is designed under the RFS to provide evidence to USAID/Washington, USAID Missions, and other Operating Units and their implementing partners – international and local – in order to design, implement, monitor, and evaluate market systems development and private-sector engagement activities that lead to inclusive and resilient agricultural-led economic growth, improved food security and nutrition, and/or increased incomes for the poor. MSP ultimately seeks to improve the effectiveness of Feed the Future, USAID, and other USG programs to bring about sustained development outcomes at scale. PSE and MSD approaches to programming support USAID's Journey to Self-Reliance[19] initiative in that they emphasize in-country resourcing, enterprise-driven growth, placing local systems at the heart of sustainable results, and identifying strategic partners best positioned to advance self-reliance and share accountability |
| **Unit of Measure:** Contractually approved buy-ins |
| **Disaggregated by:** Long-term partnership buy-ins under Obj 1 with grants; short-term learning assignments; other – those that do not fall into the first two categories. |
| **Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** As a requirement, each MSP buy-in contributes towards the advancement of learning and good practice on PSE and MSD. A key top-line metric of MSP's reach, therefore, is the number of buy-ins funded through the mechanism. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** |
| **Data Source:** MSP contract modifications |

---

[19] USAID. *The Journey to Self-Reliance: Supporting partner countries to lead their own development challenges:* https://bit.ly/3cnpAtB

| |
|---|
| **Method of Data Collection:** Collected on a rolling basis by the DCOP. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually |
| **Individual(s) responsible:** DCOP |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** N/A |
| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

**USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Cross-cutting

**Name of Indicator:** Number of MSP collaborators

**Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator? No_X__     Yes___   For Reporting Year(s)_** FY2020 – FY 2023__

**If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:**

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator tracks all organizations and independent consultants that collaborate with MSP in its work. This could include sub-contractors, grantees, independent consultants, advisors or key informants. To be counted as a *collaborator*, the individual or organization must contribute– directly or as an advisor – to an MSP technical deliverable. This contribution could be by directly providing written sections incorporated into a deliverable or by serving as a subject-matter expert providing input either by contributing ideas or providing technical reviews of MSP deliverables.

**Unit of Measure:** Organizations and independent consultants.

**Disaggregated by:** Formal (paid) and informal (unpaid).

**Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** The successful implementation of MSP requires the integration of a diverse set of expertise and viewpoints into MSP activities that support PSE and MSD learning and good practice, as well as collaboration with dispersed leaders in MSD and PSE to drive the cultural and operational transformations the activity seeks to catalyze within USAID and its implementers.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source:** MSP Activity tracker and invoices

**Method of Data Collection:** Collected on a rolling basis by Engagement Managers

**Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually

**Individual(s) responsible:** DCOP

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A

| |
|---|
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** N/A |
| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

| **USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet** |
|---|
| **Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Cross-cutting |
| **Name of Indicator:** Number of learning products |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No_X__    Yes___   For Reporting Year(s)_** FY2020 – FY 2023__ |
| **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** |
| **DESCRIPTION** |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator tracks MSP's technical output deliverables as part of its global leadership functions. Deliverables may include technical reports, briefing papers, guidance documents, and webinars, among others that support partnership development, partnership management, market research and analytics, monitoring data collection and evaluation services, data collection and analytics, research studies, and training development and delivery. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Technical output deliverable. |
| **Disaggregated by:** N/A |
| **Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** In support of MSP objectives, the Activity produces learning products that advance learning and good practice and support cultural and operational transformation on PSE and MSD within USAID/Washington, USAID Missions, partners, and beyond. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** |
| **Data Source:** MSP Learning Product Tracker |
| **Method of Data Collection:** Collected on a rolling basis by Engagement Managers |
| **Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually |
| **Individual(s) responsible:** Senior Learning and Communications Advisor |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** N/A |

| TARGETS AND BASELINE |
|---|
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

| USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet |
|---|
| **Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Cross-cutting |
| **Name of Indicator:** Number of individuals accessing MSP learning products |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No_X__     Yes___   For Reporting Year(s)_** FY2020 – FY 2023__ |
| **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** |
| **DESCRIPTION** |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator tracks the number of individuals accessing MSP's learning products or technical output deliverables. Deliverables may include technical reports, briefing papers, guidance documents, and webinars, among others that support partnership development, partnership management, market research and analytics, monitoring data collection and evaluation services, data collection and analytics, research studies, and training development and delivery. This data will be captured through webinar/workshop/conference event attendance records, and website page views and downloads of specific learning products. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Individuals. |
| **Disaggregated by:** In-person or virtual event attendance; website page views; downloads. |
| **Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** While this indicator does not capture uptake of MSP learning or direct influence of MSP on application of best practice, it does provide a measure of the volume of exposure of MSP stakeholders to Activity learning products. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** |
| **Data Source:** MSP Event registration and attendance records; website analytics. |
| **Method of Data Collection:** Collected on a rolling basis by MEL Manager. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually. |
| **Individual(s) responsible:** Senior MSD Learning Advisor. |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** N/A |

| TARGETS AND BASELINE |
| --- |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

| **USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet** |
|---|
| **Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Cross-cutting |
| **Name of Indicator:** Average client satisfaction score |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No_X__    Yes___   For Reporting Year(s)_** FY2020 – FY 2023__ |
| **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** |
| **DESCRIPTION** |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Clients for all MSP activities are given a satisfaction survey, scoring on a scale of 1-5. The indicator calculates an average score across all clients surveyed. The client satisfaction survey is to be developed in MSP's first year of implementation. Client satisfaction rankings between 1-2 indicate that MSP activities require further refinement of technical delivery. A ranking in this category is not extending learning in PSE and MSD at an effective level to facilitate the development of local leaders in either PSE or MSD, nor is it increasing significance in the program cycle. A client satisfaction ranking of 3 indicates that MSP activities have been met with satisfaction but have not risen to a substantial level for driving organizational change. A client satisfaction ranking of 4-5 indicates highly effective technical delivery for learning and incorporation of PSE and MSD into the program lifecycle, thereby effecting organizational and cultural change within the buy-in client. This survey will be conducted at the conclusion of the assignment for short-term activities and will be conducted annually for long-term activities. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Scores on a scale of 1-5 |
| **Disaggregated by:** Long-term partnership buy-ins under Obj 1; short-term learning assignments; others. |
| **Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** Client satisfaction is a key validation that MSP produces useful and effective knowledge products and services, which aim to drive organizational or cultural change and to ensure learning is self-sustained after the lifecycle of MSP. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** |
| **Data Source:** MSP client survey results |
| **Method of Data Collection:** A digital survey is submitted by clients semi-annually, or at the end of a buy-in. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually |
| **Individual(s) responsible:** MEL Manager |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |

| |
|---|
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** |
| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

**USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Objective 1

**Name of Indicator:** Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition

**Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No___    Yes_X__  For Reporting Year(s)_ FY2020 – FY 2023__**

**If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** EG.3.1-14

| DESCRIPTION |
| --- |

**Precise Definition(s):** The indicator includes new long-term capital investments (e.g., property, plant, and equipment and other fixed assets) and new operating capital investments (e.g., inputs or inventory) leveraged by the USG private sector co-investment – both cash and in-kind – for implementing specific activities (e.g., resulting from a successful Global Development Alliance application) should also be included. It includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as inputs (e.g., seeds, fertilizer, pesticides, etc.) and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment used for post-harvest transformation or processing of agricultural products or the transport of agricultural products to markets. In-kind investments, which should be valued at market rates, could include legal or business development services.

"New USG commitments" refers to funds in the form of a direct loan, part of a grant, or other award designed to leverage additional funds from private sector organizations. Subsidies paid to structure a guarantee or insurance product do not count as new USG commitments. For multi-year activities, commitments are recorded at the outset of the activity, if made prior to the start of the activity, or during the year when they are made, if commitments are received during implementation of an activity.

"Private sector" includes for-profit formal companies managing nutrition, agriculture, and/or food system-related activities. A community-based organization (CBO) or nongovernmental organization (NGO) investment may be included if the CBO or NGO engages in for-profit nutrition, agriculture, and/or food system-related activities.

Investment" is defined as any use of private-sector resources intended to increase future production, output, or income, etc. Investments are recorded on a yearly basis, as they are made. In-kind investments are recorded at market value in USD.

"Leveraged by the USG" indicates that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities supported by the Feed the Future initiative. Usually, the Feed the Future activities will take the form of a grant, direct loan, guarantee, or insurance coverage from the USG (see examples below).


Examples:

Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)/United States International Development Finance Corporation (USIDFC):

1. OPIC provides political risk insurance on a $40 million equity investment by a U.S. investor in a large-scale commercial farm in Zambia that produces wheat, maize, barley and soya. OPIC is insuring 90% of the investment, or $36 million. The farm's expansion is also financed by a $10 million loan from a local commercial bank and a $5 million loan from the International Finance Corporation of the World Bank Group directly to the Zambian farm. The investment and loan funds will be used to expand and upgrade the farm's irrigation system and other infrastructure improvements. The **total private sector capital leveraged is $50 million,**

consisting of the sum of the U.S. equity firm's investment ($40 million) and the local commercial debt ($10 million). The debt and equity investments are reported in the year in which they are made. The IFC's $5 million is not included, as it is money from a multi-lateral, and is not considered "private sector investment," nor is it "leveraged" by OPIC.

2. OPIC provides a $10 million direct loan to a U.S.-based NGO to expand its working capital lending to small farmers and co-ops located in South America. The $40 million expansion also includes $20 million raised through private placement bonds and $10 million in cash equity from the NGO. In this example, the **total new USG commitment is $10 million and the private capital leveraged by the OPIC investment is $30 million**. These investments are reported in the year in which they are made.

USAID:

USAID provides a 50% loan portfolio guarantee to a U.S.-based impact investor to expand its portfolio into small and growing businesses in the agriculture sector in Feed the Future target countries. The guarantee will cover 50% of investments made, up to a total of $17.5 million in investments. The total amount of private sector capital leveraged that could be reported is $17.5 million. The **private capital leveraged actually reported is the amount that was actually invested**, and is reported in the year in which the investments are made.

---

**Unit of Measure:** U.S. Dollars

---

**Disaggregated by:** Types of investment:

- **USG commitment amount** (using "commitment" to include funding in the form of direct loans or grants)

- **Private-sector partner leveraged amount** (using "leveraged" to include both cash and in-kind investment valued at market rates from the private-sector partner)

---

**Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** Although "dollars leveraged" is not on its own the most meaningful indicator for assessing development impact, it provides a normalized metric for understanding scale of additionality across diverse contexts. Supplemental buy-in level indicators and complementary quantitative and qualitative measures at the global leadership level in future iterations of MSP's monitoring plan will seek to add nuance and depth of meaning to the dollar value leveraged figure. MSP more broadly aims to identify meaningful indicators to measure the effectiveness of USAID PSE efforts for development results and the priorities of private-sector partners.

---

## PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

**Data Source:** Private-sector financial records, program data, and US Government agency records.

---

**Method of Data Collection:** Collected on a rolling basis by the Senior PSE Advisor.

---

**Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually

---

| **Individual(s) responsible:** Senior PSE Advisor |
|---|
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** |
| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |

| USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet |
|---|
| **Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Activity Purpose, Activity Output, etc.):** Objective 1 |
| **Name of Indicator:** Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of MSP funding |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Reporting Indicator?  No_X__     Yes___  For Reporting Year(s)___**<br>**If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** N/A |
| **DESCRIPTION** |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator counts the number of public-private partnerships (PPPs) formed during the reporting period as a result of MSP-funded activities.<br><br>A public-private partnership is considered formed when there is a clear written agreement between two or more formal entities to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity or entities. A public entity can be the national or a subnational government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner; USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. It includes state enterprises that are nonprofit. A state-owned enterprise that seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully) is counted as a private entity.<br><br>To count as a PPP, the private entity must contribute something additional, or above and beyond what it would normally contribute as a usual cost of doing business. Do not count as a PPP an agreement that involves the private entity simply attending to its day-to-day business needs, purchase agreements between a firm and Activity's beneficiaries, investments made by a firm in its own operations, or loans made under a USAID guarantee.<br><br>PPPs can be long or short in duration (length is not a criterion for measurement). A mission or an activity may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. Only public-private partnerships formed during the current reporting year should be counted. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included. Only the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year should be counted, and not the number of transactions. Partnerships that include multiple partners should be counted only once.<br><br>Partnerships should only be counted once at formation – or a modification of pre-existing partnership – and not every year of its implementation. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number |
| **Disaggregated by:** N/A. |
| **Rationale or Justification for Indicator (*optional*):** The assumption of this indicator is that more partnerships are desirable and contribute to inclusive and resilient agricultural-led economic growth, improved food security and nutrition, and/or increased incomes for the poor. |

| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** |
| --- |
| **Data Source:** MSP grants documentation. |
| **Method of Data Collection and Construction:** The data collected is a direct measure of the number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of MSP investments. Since MSP defines a PPP as a clear, written agreement between USAID (represented by MSP buy-ins) and a private entity such as a for-profit company or non-governmental organization, the data used to calculate the number of PPP formed are derived from a simple count of signed partner agreements. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** Semi-annually |
| **Individual(s) responsible:** DCOP |

| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| --- |
| **Dates of previous data quality assessments and names of reviewer(s):** N/A |
| **Dates of future data quality assessments (*optional*):** N/A |
| **Known data limitations:** There are no significant limitations to the collection if this data. |

| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| --- |
| **Baseline value:** 0 |
| **Rationale for Targets (*optional*):** |

| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| --- |
| **Changes to Indicator:** |
| **Other notes (*optional*):** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: October 16, 2020** |